

**SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT  
FOR THE  
HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT  
SUPPORT SERVICES (HR MODSS) CONTRACT  
LYNDON B. JOHNSON SPACE CENTER**

On February 11, 2011, I met with the members of the Procurement Buying Team (PBT) appointed to evaluate proposals for the Human Resources Management Operations and Development Support Services (HR MODSS) Contract Solicitation, NNJ09302655R. The HR MODSS contract is to be awarded as an Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ), Firm Fixed Price (FFP) contract. The basic period of performance for this acquisition is 2 years beginning May 1, 2011, through April 30, 2013; and there are three 1-year options. The minimum contract value is \$9,960,000 and the maximum contract value is \$24,900,000. This acquisition is a follow-on contract that merges some of the effort of two JSC contracts: 1) Human Resources Procurement Office (HRPO) and 2) Human Resources Support Services (HRSS) contract.

The goal of the HR MODSS solicitation is to procure Human Resource services to support Johnson Space Center (JSC), the Sonny Carter Training Facility, and Ellington Field in Houston, TX, the White Sands Test Facility in Las Cruces, New Mexico, and other NASA operating locations that may be determined subsequent to contract award. The scope of the HR MODSS effort supports the Human Resource activities at JSC and consists of the planning, execution, and operations of technical, analytical, and consulting duties, administrative support, data maintenance, and HR systems support.

**Background**

In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 5.2, "Synopsis of Proposed Contract Actions", this proposed contract action was synopsized on May 11, 2009, at the Fed Biz Opps website and thereafter placed on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service business opportunities website. A draft solicitation was issued on February 2, 2010, and a pre-proposal conference ensued.

On March 29, 2010, the contracting officer issued the Request for Proposal (RFP), NNJ09302655R. Amendment Number 1 was posted on April 13, 2010, to provide the questions and answers received in response to the solicitation and update sections of the solicitation in response to the questions received. Amendment Number 2 was posted on November 19, 2010, to provide the revision and replacement pages to the RFP for the change in Phase-in Plan and Period of Performance. Amendment Number 3 was posted on November 30, 2010, to provide revisions and replacement pages to the RFP.

The procurement was conducted as a competition under Section 8(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)) under North American Industry Classification System

(NAICS) code 541612 with a size standard of \$7M. The RFP proposal was divided into four volumes with separate due dates. Volume II for Past Performance was due on April 22, 2010. Volume I for Technical, Volume III for Cost/Price, and Volume IV for Model Contract were due on April 29, 2010.

Offers were received from four companies. The initial screening of the offers resulted in a determination of "unacceptable proposal" for The Royster Group, as prescribed in NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305-70, "Identification of unacceptable proposals". The Royster Group's proposal lacked a Management Operating Plan, Safety and Health Plan, a proposed approach to address each predefined Qualitative Value Characteristic, and Cost/Price templates.

As a result, three proposals remained to be evaluated: Logical Innovations, Inc. (Logical); Wichita Tribal Enterprises, LLC (WTE); and GAPSI-Banner Joint Venture, LLC (GAPSI-Banner).

### **Evaluation Procedures**

The evaluation of the proposals was conducted in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70 the approved evaluation plan and procedures prescribed by FAR Part 15, "Contracting by Negotiation" and its NFS counterpart, same title, along with JSC Procurement Instruction (JPI) 52.215-22, "Combination of Lowest Priced Technically Acceptable and Trade-Off of Other Non-Cost Related Factors and Cost or Price". The RFP noted the HR MODSS procurement would be conducted utilizing a combination of technically acceptable baseline requirements and the tradeoff of predefined Qualitative Value Characteristics, Past Performance, and Cost/Price.

NASA's technical acceptability requirements were stated as baseline requirements. The Technical Acceptability baseline requirements were comprised of the following subfactors: 1) Technical Requirements (SOW and Sample Scenario), 2) Management Operating Plan, 3) Teaming Arrangement; 4) Safety and Health Plan, 5) Organizational Conflict of Interest Plan, 6) Phase-In Plan, 7) Key Personnel, and 8) Total Compensation Plan.

The evaluation of the Technical Acceptability baseline requirements was based on a "meets" or "does not meet" determination. Offerors that "did not meet" NASA's baseline would be eliminated from further evaluation. Offerors that "did meet" NASA's technical acceptability baseline would remain in the evaluation process for the predefined "Qualitative Value Characteristics", "Past Performance", and "Cost/Price".

Two predefined Qualitative Value Characteristics (VCs) were used as tradeoff factors. These were: Recruitment of Highly-Qualified and Exceptionally-Experienced Personnel as VC1; and Retention of Personnel as VC2. The predefined VCs were evaluated and rated using the following adjectival ratings: "Significant Value Added", "Minimal Value Added", and "No Value Added".

"Significant Value Added" was defined as: The Offeror's proposed response to the

predefined Value Characteristic is appropriate for/applies to the value characteristic and would substantially improve performance and/or substantially enhance the overall contract objectives.

"Minimal Value Added" was defined as: The Offeror's proposed response to the predefined Value Characteristic is appropriate for/applies to the Value Characteristic and may minimally improve performance and/or enhance the overall contract objectives.

"No Value Added" was defined as: The Offeror's proposed response to the predefined Value Characteristic is not appropriate for or does not apply to the Value Characteristic and/or the Offeror's response to the predefined Value Characteristic would have little or no effect on performance and/or enhance the overall contract objectives.

Past Performance indicates how well an Offeror performed on earlier work and can be a significant indicator of how well the Offeror can be expected to perform the work at hand. The Offeror's Past Performance for recent and relevant experience was evaluated by the PBT, as provided in the Offerors' proposal, communications with listed references, and other information including, but not limited to the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) and the Past Performance Management Database (PPMD) obtained independently by the PBT. The RFP noted the "relevancy criteria" for Past Performance as relevant technical experience and capabilities in human resources, modern software tool sets and in training and development processes. Past Performance ratings for the Offeror and major subcontractors were evaluated and rated using the following scale: "Very High Level of Confidence", "High Level of Confidence", "Moderate Level of Confidence", "Low Level of Confidence", "Very Low Level of Confidence", and "Neutral".

A Price analysis of each offeror's proposed fully-burdened IDIQ labor rates was conducted. All proposed resources were assessed for validity and adequacy. If the rates in the price proposal differed from those listed in Part I, Section B of the Model Contract, the rates listed in Section B of the Model Contract were used as a basis for developing an assessment of Price risk.

### **Competitive Range Determination**

In accordance with the evaluation procedures described in the RFP (Section M, "Evaluation Factors for Award"), I determined as the Source Selection Authority (SSA) to establish a competitive range consisting of the most highly rated proposals. On September 10, 2010, I determined that it was in NASA's best interest to establish a competitive range of two Offerors due to the clear delineation between Logical, which was evaluated as a "does not meet" for technical acceptability baseline, and both WTE and GAPSI-Banner, that "did meet" NASA'S technical acceptability baseline. As a result, WTE and GAPSI-Banner would remain in the competitive range for further evaluation of each company's approach to the two predefined Qualitative Value Characteristics; Past Performance; and Cost/Price.

## **Discussions and Evaluation of Final Proposal Revisions**

All Offerors were informed of their exclusion or inclusion in the competitive range via letters dated October 19, 2010. Accordingly, the PBT invited WTE and GAPSI-Banner to be included in the competitive range and to provide written responses to competitive range questions by November 2, 2010. The PBT reviewed the written responses and conducted oral discussions to correct, clarify, substantiate, or confirm the contents of proposals. The Offerors were given the opportunity to submit final proposal revisions (FPRs) and a signed model contract reflecting the Offerors' intent to be contractually bound. The FPRs were received on December 17, 2010, closing oral discussions. The results of the final PBT evaluation were presented to me on February 11, 2011.

### **Decision**

In making my selection decision, I first reviewed the relative importance of the evaluation factors. For this solicitation, the evaluation factors state that (1) if all offers are of approximately equal merit, award will be made to the Offeror with the lowest price, (2) NASA will consider awarding to an Offeror with higher merit if the difference in Price is commensurate with added value, or (3) whose offer has lower merit if the Price (or Cost) differential between it and other offers warrants doing so. I looked at the two distinct "VCs", "Past Performance" and "Cost/Price" risk ratings given to the two Offerors in competitive range, WTE and GAPSI-Banner. I reviewed and concurred on the following analyses which were conducted by the PBT:

#### **WTE Value Characteristics Analysis**

I observed that WTE received "minimal value added" for VC1 (Recruitment of Highly-Effective, Exceptionally-Experienced Personnel) and "no value added" for VC2 (Retention of Personnel) as follows:

##### **Value Characteristic 1- Recruitment of Highly-Effective, Exceptionally-Experienced Personnel**

WTE's proposal was evaluated for processes and procedures to support the ability to recruit highly-qualified and exceptionally-experienced personnel. WTE made changes from its initial proposal to its FPR that the PBT determined diminished the value added. I agreed with this assessment.

I agreed with the PBT that WTE described its ability to recruit experienced personnel; however, WTE restricted the relocation bonuses and the special workweek program to the major subcontractor, Anadarko, without providing detail or explanation of how these benefits would be executed. WTE identified its fringe benefits to address recruitment as required by VC1 such as 401k retirement plans matching programs with immediate vesting of 100%, paid time off for vacations and sick leave, and disability coverage; however, the proposed fringe benefits package lacked detail for several proposed

benefits, making it difficult for NASA to determine the value added to its recruitment package.

I agreed with the PBT's determination that WTE'S proposed approach was not fully described; however, the proposal did provide an adequate description of some processes and procedures to recruit highly-qualified and exceptionally-experienced personnel to earn a minimal value added rating. I concluded, as did the PBT, that WTE received "minimal value added" for VC1.

### *Value Characteristic 2 - Retention of Personnel*

WTE's proposal was evaluated for processes and procedures to support the ability to retain highly-qualified and exceptionally-experienced personnel to meet the needs of NASA. WTE made changes from its initial proposal to its FPR that the PBT determined diminished the value added. I agreed with this assessment.

WTE did not adequately describe highly-effective and thorough retention methods and techniques beyond standard industry practices. For example, though WTE proposed somewhat effective management techniques for a retaining personnel, such as some training and tuition reimbursement for undergraduate course work based on a completion grade, to provide benefits such as cost of living pay increases and an increase of paid time off for vacation for employees based on tenure, WTE did not adequately propose retention processes or innovative methods for employee performance management, bonuses for non-management employees, or career path options to retain highly-skilled employees. I agreed with the PBT that WTE described some effective management techniques and some training programs and continuing education options. However, WTE did not effectively and thoroughly expand on specific WTE techniques and programs in this VC beyond the baseline requirements.

I agreed with the PBT's assessment of WTE's proposed training and tuition reimbursement for undergraduate courses based on the course completion grade. WTE did not propose tuition reimbursement for graduate courses. I concurred with the PBT's assessment that the proposed fringe benefits package lacked sufficient detail for benefits proposed by WTE, such as retention bonuses (which appear to be low), incentives, and merit raises.

I agreed with the PBT that the failure to demonstrate highly-effective retention methods and techniques limits WTE'S ability to retain highly-qualified and exceptionally experienced personnel. Overall, the proposed processes and techniques provide "no value added" beyond the baseline requirements.

### **WTE's Past Performance**

WTE received an adjectival rating of "moderate level of confidence" for the past performance factor. The PBT determined, and I concurred, that this confidence level is based on WTE's recent and relevant experience provided in the proposal, the PBT's

communications with listed references, and information found in the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) and the Past Performance Management Database (PPMD). The PBT determined that the Past Performance referenced by the prime contractor was for work determined to be of "Low" to "Neutral" relevance, while there was only one highly relevant past performance reference which was submitted by the major subcontractor; the other three references for the major subcontract were of very low relevance to the SOW requirements.

### **GAPSI-Banner Value Characteristics Analysis**

I noted that the PBT assigned GAPSI-Banner "significant value added" for VC1 (Recruitment of Highly-Effective, Exceptionally-Experienced Personnel) and "significant value added" for VC2 (Retention of Personnel) as follows:

#### *Value Characteristics 1 - Recruitment of Highly-Effective, Exceptionally-Experienced Personnel*

For VC1, GAPSI-Banner thoroughly described their detailed recruitment methodology and included effective, thorough, and complete discussion of processes. GAPSI-Banner effectively demonstrated recruitment success by tailoring their methods to recruit personnel to meet the requirements for each position utilizing a step-by-step process and numerous proven and innovative techniques to source candidates. GAPSI-Banner effectively described how its program management and human resources team will enhance their recruitment approach to more effectively satisfy the requirements of the statement of work. The human resources team incorporates the support of a program director, a client service manager, and a dedicated program management office comprised of recruitment manager, contracts manager, human resources manager, and other executives. The program manager and this human resources team will: 1) collaborate with JSC/HRO to customize its approach for identifying new candidates by continually discussing customer requirements throughout the process; 2) conduct a thorough screening process of qualifications and skills in order to select the most qualified individual to provide custom-fit candidates versus stock candidates; and 3) initiate a systematic onboarding process, (including orientation, establishing of reporting contacts, and enrollment in required training to provide clear direction and expectations). I agree with the PBT that GAPSI-Banner's proposal thoroughly describes a highly-effective, competitive benefits package by effectively and completely identifying and demonstrating benefits with extensive options including but not limited to the following fringe benefits: health insurance with low deductibles, 401k retirement plans with multiple investment fund options matching programs with immediate vesting of 100%, paid time off for vacations and sick leave, disability coverage, accidental death insurance, flexible work schedules/credit time/special work week as a true work-life balance policy benefiting employees, Employee Wellness Program, and discount programs. GAPSI-Banner also proposes to offer full benefits portability for current GAPSI incumbents, and retention of tenure-based benefits for other JSC/HRO incumbents. The PBT assessed significant value added for the GAPSI-Banner referral incentive program. I agreed with the PBT, and found significant value in

these comprehensive and highly-effective recruitment methods and techniques.

### Value Characteristic 2 – Retention of Personnel

I concurred with the PBT that for VC2, GAPSI-Banner proposed numerous, specific, highly-effective management techniques, extensive employee performance management methodology, and a detailed communication plan which includes but is not limited to conducting and monitoring effective management and employee discussions and encouraging open dialogue, which will enable retention of highly-qualified employees above the baseline of its Management Operating Plan. GAPSI-Banner effectively described how its program management and human resources team, including indirect corporate support, will enhance their retention approach to more effectively satisfy the requirements of the statement of work. I find of value GAPSI-Banner's benefits package, which thoroughly describes a highly competitive approach that includes, but is not limited to annual cost of living increases, the accrual of paid time-off for vacations over a short-period of time for employees based on tenure, bonuses and merit raises for performance, and numerous options to provide rewards and recognition, as well as reviews of current offerings and assessments for providing additional benefits as new options become available. The PBT determined, and I found value in GAPSI-Banner's proposed career advancement opportunities, continuing education, and training programs which include employee coaching and mentoring opportunities to retain skilled employees within the company. GAPSI-Banner provided details for continuing to execute a thorough employee on-boarding process (tailored training to include ongoing refresher training on policies, procedures, and standards, and assimilation techniques to reduce anxiety and encourage team work) and standard operating procedures to clearly outline expectations. This extensive approach provides significant value to NASA as it is likely to ensure GAPSI-Banner is successful in preparing and retaining highly-qualified employees. I agreed with the PBT that GAPSI-Banner's highly effective retention methods and techniques ensure GAPSI-Banner's ability to retain highly-qualified and exceptionally experienced personnel and are beyond baseline requirements, and provide significant value added.

### **GAPSI-Banner Past Performance**

The PBT assessed, and I concurred in the GAPSI-Banner adjectival rating of "high level of confidence" for the past performance factor. The PBT considered GAPSI-Banner's recent and highly relevant experience provided in their proposal, the team's communications with listed references, information found in the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), and information found in the Past Performance Management Database (PPMD) and found the Offeror's past performance to have a "High Level of Confidence." I assessed, that much of the referenced work for the prime and subcontractors was found to be highly relevant to the HR MODSS requirements and GAPSI-Banner's references described the company as providing excellent management, working in partnership with the Government, and excellent technical performance. Multiple respondents stated GAPSI-Banner provided excellent

candidates for various positions. As a result, I found value in GAPSI-Banner's Past Performance and the high level of confidence assigned by the PBT.

I agree with the PBT's determination that the Past Performance of the prime contractor's joint venture partners' two past performance records were of high relevance when considering complexity, size, and scope, therefore minimizing the risk that the contractor will perform at an unacceptable level, and an indication that the contractor will deliver support without extensive follow-up effort or constant surveillance to ensure performance for NASA.

### **Cost/Price**

I also looked at WTE's final proposed price \$16.7 million, and GAPSI-Banner's final proposed price, \$18.49 million. I concurred with the Contracting Officer that adequate price competition was obtained and the proposed prices are fair and reasonable. The proposed prices were the result of competition. Additionally, the prices were compared to the Independent Government Estimate and historical prices for these services to validate that the prices were fair and reasonable. Of significance to my final selection decision will be that under the evaluation criteria NASA can consider awarding to an Offeror with higher merit if the difference in price is commensurate with the added value.

### **SUMMARY ANALYSIS AND DECISION**

My review of the award process confirms that the PBT complied with the evaluation process stated in the RFP, and I concurred with the PBT's careful evaluation of WTE and GAPSI-Banner.


Before making my final decision I again reviewed the relative importance of the evaluation factors and I carefully reassessed the VCs, Past Performance, and the Cost/Price risk ratings given to both WTE and GAPSI-Banner.

I observed that WTE received "minimal value added" for VC1 (Recruitment of Highly-Effective, Exceptionally-Experienced Personnel) and "no value added" for VC2 (Retention of Personnel). I contrasted the WTE finding with the GAPSI-Banner rating of a "significant value added" for VC1 (Recruitment of Highly-Effective, Exceptionally-Experienced Personnel) and "significant value added" for VC2 (Retention of Personnel).

I then turned to the "Past Performance" factor. WTE received an adjectival rating of "moderate level of confidence" for Past Performance. I then contrasted WTE's Past Performance rating with GAPSI-Banner's rating. GAPSI-Banner earned a "high level of confidence" rating. This was based upon GAPSI-Banner's recent and highly relevant experience. I found great value in the highly relevant past performance as it relates to the HR MODSS requirements, as GAPSI-Banner's references described the company as providing excellent management, working in partnership with the Government, and excellent technical performance.

I carefully considered the total value GAPSI-Banner presents NASA for both VC1, "Recruitment of Highly-Qualified and Exceptionally-Experienced Personnel", and VC2, "Retention of Personnel", as well as the highly relevant contracts analyzed by the PBT under the "Past Performance" criteria. I noted that GAPSI-Banner's price over 5 years is approximately \$1.8 million more than WTE, however, NASA can consider awarding to an Offeror with higher merit if the difference in price is commensurate with added value.

I have determined that GAPSI-Banner proposes significant added value to NASA above the RFP requirements that will have the direct effect of enhancing the Human Resource activities at JSC. Based on all of these considerations, I have concluded that the offer submitted by GAPSI-Banner Joint Venture, LLC is the most advantageous to NASA, and hereby select GAPSI-Banner Joint Venture, LLC for award of the contract.

  
Debra L. Johnson  
Source Selection Authority

3 / 11 / 11  
Date